

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-24 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-24 are rejected by Examiner.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-18, 22 and 23 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786 to Densmore et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,146 to Slotznick.

Concerning the above mentioned claims, the Examiner states in the present office action that Densmore et al. does not explicitly [indicate] a level of indirection from application programming interfaces used by a class locator, the wrapper indirection level providing for different caches to be used for the selected elements. Applicant agrees with the Examiner on this point. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that Slotznick teaches the missing limitations.

Slotznick teaches a system for automatically switching between two executable programs for display purposes on a user's computer display. Slotznick states, in relevant part:

The primary purpose of this invention is to automatically minimize (or otherwise mask or hide) a window of a program while the program is processing information and then to automatically return the window to its previous size and position at some timed interval, or when the processing is done, or some other event occurs. ...The device may be alternatively characterized as automatically switching between program interfaces; switching away from the interface of a program that has begun an information processing operation and switching to the interface of a different program that is ready for user interaction, and then after the information processing operation has been completed, switching back.

Slotznick, Col. 3 lines 34-53.

The Examiner refers Applicant to Slotznick col. 12, lines 32-35 to cite the existence of a cache and to col. 20, lines 11-22 to cite the use of a wrapper. Applicant notes that the Slotznick defines a wrapper as follows:

The Application Wrapper is an application written to allow for an outside process to maintain and control certain aspects of a second process GUI

(graphical user interface) as well as certain other aspects of the application such as the timer.... The Application Wrapper makes extensive use of posting messages to a programs event loop so that it may control a Windows game. (col. 20, lines 1-10).

Further, Slotznick states in col. 20, lines 29-37.

In the preferred implementation, the base class is designed for games such as Microsoft™ Solitaire that run in windows mode on computers with a Windows 95 operating system. ... The preferred implementation has a derived class for each supported game (i.e. separate derived classes for Solitaire, Free Cell, Hearts and other supported games). The structure allows for the addition of other games very easily by deriving a class from the base class and overloading the member functions: launchGame, gameControlLoop, pauseGame, resumeGame, and shutDown to do the required tasks for each of the self documented member function names.

Applicant notes that Slotznick teaches the use of an application wrapper to control a graphical user interface. A preferred embodiment in Slotznick is in the use of games in conjunction with a graphical user interface. Slotznick does not teach or suggest a level of indirection from application programming interfaces used by a class locator and a wrapper indirection level providing for different caches to be used for selected elements as in independent Claim 1 of the present Application for Patent. Independent Claims 5, 10, 15, 17 and 22 have similar limitations that are not found in Slotznick.

Neither Densmore et al. nor Slotznick teach or suggest the a level of indirection from APIs used by a class locator. Neither reference teaches or suggests the use of a wrapper indirection level to provide for different caches to be used for selected elements. Consequently, neither Densmore et al. nor Slotznick, either alone or in combination, can render independent Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, and 22 obvious.

Additionally, Applicant believes that one of skill in the art would not be inclined to combine the references because, at minimum, Slotznick addresses the problem of enhancing a graphical user interface whereas Densmore et al. addresses the problem of implementing a class hierarchy of objects. The problems being solved and the implementations disclosed in the references simply do not suggest one another let alone the claim limitations of the current Application for Patent.

Further, the Examiner stated, in an earlier Office Action dated 10/8/2003, that concerning Claims 5 and 23, Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate forwarding the search request to search the appropriate class path for the search request. Concerning Claim 15, the Examiner stated that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate to invoke element specific search methods. Concerning Claim 17, the Examiner stated that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate to map class searches to each element for independent handling. Concerning Claim 22, the Examiner stated that Densmore et al. does not explicitly indicate a transparent level of indirection to services. Applicant continues to agree with the Examiner on these points and notes that Slotznick does not supply the deficiency in teaching.

Applicant therefore respectfully traverses the current 35 U.S.C §103(a) rejection for the above stated reasons and submits that independent Claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23 and corresponding dependent Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16, 19-21 and 24 are in a condition for allowance.

Currently, Claims 4, 7-9 and 19-21 also stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786 to Densmore et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,146 to Slotznick and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,261 to Glass. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Without addressing the propriety of the Examiner's assertion, Claims 4, 7-9 and 19-21 depend from what Applicant believes to be allowable base claims, thus Claims 4, 7-9 and 19-21 are likewise allowable over the cited art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for all pending claims.

DOCKET NO.: 129989.1 / MSFT-0517

PATENT


Application No.: 09/266,675

Office Action Dated: 3/25/2004

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application in light of the remarks presented above. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Date: June 2, 2004



Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50, 800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439